

### **REMARKS**

As a preliminary matter, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative in discussing Applicant's proposed amendments on May 26, 2010 and June 23, 2010.

In the Final Office Action,<sup>1</sup> the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-7, 10-12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24-33, 37-40, 44, and 45<sup>2</sup> under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,054,867 to Bosley et al. ("Bosley") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,233,686 to Zenchelsky et al. ("Zenchelsky"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,880,089 to Bommareddy et al. ("Bommareddy").

Applicant proposes to amend claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 37, 38, 44, and 45. Claims 2, 8, 9, 13-15, 18-20, 23, 34-36, and 41-43 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24-33, 37-40, 44, and 45 are currently pending, with claims 1, 10, 24, 27-31, 37, 38, 44, and 45 being independent. Based on the foregoing proposed amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the pending claims.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

<sup>2</sup> Although the Final Office Action at page 9 indicates that claims 1-7, 10-12, 21, 22, 24-33, 37-40, 44, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bosley in view of Zenchelsky and further in view of Bommareddy, claim 2 was previously canceled and the Final Office Action at page 13 provides an alleged basis for rejecting claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Bosley, Zenchelsky, and Bommareddy. Applicant respectfully requests clarification so that Applicant can provide a complete response to the Final Office Action.

**I. The § 103 Rejection of Claims 1, 3-7, 10-12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24-33, 37-40, 44, and 45 Based on Bosley, Zenchelsky, and Bommareddy**

The Examiner suggested that all independent claims be amended “to include ‘determine quadrant value’ based on Multidimensional space or tuple space with respect to ‘hash function and modulo division.’” Final Office Action at 2; See also Interview Summary mailed on November 18, 2009, (“Interview Summary”) at 4. The Examiner indicated that “such amendment will overcome the cited prior art and would result [in] an allowance.” Interview Summary at 4.

In order to advance prosecution, Applicant proposes to amend independent claim 1 to recite, among other things, “modifying, by the first processing unit, a first address of the first packet into a first modified address such that a quadrant identifier determined using a hash function and modulo division from the first modified address corresponds to the first node number assigned only to the first firewall node.” Applicant proposes to similarly amend independent claims 27, 30, and 45.

In addition, Applicant proposes to amend independent claim 10 to recite, among other things, “determining, by the first processing unit, whether the N-tuple address of the received packet is within an N-tuple space assigned to the first processing unit based on a quadrant identifier and a firewall node number corresponding to the N-tuple space assigned to the first processing unit, wherein an N-tuple space assigned to each of the plurality of processing units is different, and wherein the quadrant identifier is determined from the N-tuple address using a hash function and modulo division.” Applicant proposes to similarly amend independent claims 28, 31, and 38.

Independent claim 24 recites, among other things, “determining a quadrant identifier based on the read N-tuple address, a hash function, and modulo division.” Independent claims 29, 37, and 44, although of different scope, recite elements that are similar to those recited in independent claim 24.

Independent claims 1, 10, 24, 27-31, 37, 38, 44, and 45 are therefore allowable over the cited art as indicated by the Examiner. Because any claim that depends from an allowable claim is also allowable, dependent claims 3-7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 25, 26, 32, 33, 39, and 40 are allowable by virtue of their dependence from an allowable independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1, 3-7, 10-12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24-33, 37-40, 44, and 45.

## **II. Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1, 3-7, 10-12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24-33, 37-40, 44, and 45 in condition for allowance. Applicant submits that the proposed amendments of claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 37, 38, 44, and 45 do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully points out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicant's invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment

would allow the Applicant to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicant submits that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicant therefore requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 12, 2010

By: 

Jeffrey A. Berkowitz  
Reg. No. 36,743